

Application No. 10/051,951  
Amendment dated June 14, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of June 10, 2006

Docket No.: 3895-0102P

Page 26 of 29

### **REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 3-23, 25-27, 30-50, 52-54, 56, 57, 59-78, 80-84 and 88-93 are now present in the application. Claims have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 28, 29, 55 and 58 have been cancelled. Claims 88-90 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

#### **Reasons For Entry Of Amendments**

As the Examiner will note, the amendments to the claims are simply made to change the dependency of dependent claims from cancelled independent claims 1, 28 and 90 to allowed independent claims 88-90. Therefore, no new issue is raised. Entry and consideration of the foregoing amendments are respectfully requested.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner has indicated that claims 25, 52, 80 and 88-90 are allowed. Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter by the Examiner.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 28-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 55-57, 59, 77 83, 85-87 and 91-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick, (U.S. Patent No. 5,710,884; hereinafter as "Dedrick") in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0133500; hereinafter as "Arlein"). Claims 5-6, 32-33 and 60-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Arlein, and further in view of

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch &amp; Birch, LLP

EHC/GH/cl

Application No. 10/051,951  
Amendment dated June 14, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of June 10, 2006

Docket No.: 3895-0102P

Page 27 of 29

Nguyen (U.S. Patent No. 5,638,448). Claims 7-9 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Arlein, and further in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,546,002 B1). Claims 12-16 and 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Arlein, and further in view of Bull et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,901,287). Claims 18 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Arlein, and further in view of Mohan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,505,230 B1). Claims 19 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Arlein, and further in view of Chun et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0184527 A1). Claims 23, 50 and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Arlein, and further in view of Nagahara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,246 B1). Claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Arlein, and further in view of the article entitled "Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further" (hereinafter as "Net Security Standard article"). Claims 27, 54 and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Arlein, and further in view of Charisius et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0077842 A1). Claims 62-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Arlein and the Net Security Standard article, and further in view of Kim. Claims 67-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Arlein and the Net Security Standard article, and in further view of Bull et al. Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Arlein and the Net Security Standard article, and further in view of Mohan et al. Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch &amp; Birch, LLP

EHC/GH/cl

Application No. 10/051,951  
Amendment dated June 14, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of June 10, 2006

Docket No.: 3895-0102P

Page 28 of 29

in view of Arlein and the Net Security Standard article, and in further view of Chun et al. Claim 84 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Arlein and the Net Security Standard article, and further in view of Lim et al. (U.S. Patent 6,728,843 B1). These rejections, insofar as they pertain to the presently pending claims, are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

While not conceding to the Examiner's rejections, but merely to expedite prosecution, as the Examiner will note, independent claims 1, 28 and 55 have been cancelled. In addition, dependent claims 3-23, 25-27, 30-50, 52-54, 56, 57, 59-78, 80-84 and 91-93 now depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowed independent claims 88-90, respectively. Therefore, these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch &amp; Birch, LLP

EHC/GH/cl

Application No. 10/051,951  
Amendment dated June 14, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of June 10, 2006

Docket No.: 3895-0102P

Page 29 of 29

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 09/0461 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 14, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Esther H. Chong  
Esther H. Chong  
Registration No.: 40,953  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

EHC/GH/cl